DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 044 621 AC 008 784

TITLE	The 1966 Audience of the New York State Museum: An Evaluation of the Museum's Visitors Program.
INSTITUTION	Janus Museums Consultants, Ltd., Toronto (Ontario).: New York State Education Dept., Albany. Div. of Evaluation.
PUB DATE	Jan 68
NOTE	70p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.60
DESCRIPTORS	Age Groups, *Audiences, Educational Background, Family Income, *Museums, Occupations, *Participant Characteristics, Participant Satisfaction, *Program Evaluation, Sex Differences

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to provide the New York State Museum (NYSM) with a profile of its audience during 1966. A total of 1,544 persons were interviewed. Visitors came from seven counties, with Albany accounting for 58%. A comparison was made with Royal Ontario Museum on the basis of group size, sex, age, educational level, occupation, and family income. Both museums showed under-representation of those under 14. At NYSM the over-50 group was also under-represented while the 15-24 group was over-represented. Professionals, students, and housewives comprised the bulk of the respondents. The majority had incomes of $7,000 and over with the $5,000-$6,999 running a poor second. Persons with minimal education made up 3% of the NYSM audience. Other areas covered were: frequency and recency of visit, activity prior to visit, government employees, employment locale, transportation, knowledge of exhibit through promotion, and reasons for visit. Evaluation directed attention to the following: there are too few rest areas; exhibits are too technical and old-fashioned; school classes visiting during the day are too noisy; the use of tape-recorded "labels" and other audio devices would help the problem of comprehension; visitors would like restaurant or coffee shop facilities; the location is poor. Appendixes include references and questionnaires. (NL)

EDO 44621

THE 1966 AUDIENCE OF THE NEW YORK STATE MUSEUM

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

AN EVALUATION OF THE MUSEUM'S VISITORS PROGRAM

conducted jointly by
The New York State Education Department
and
Janus Museums Consultants, Limited
Toronto, Canada

January 1968

The University of the State of New York
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Division of Evaluation
Albany, New York 12224

AC008784

THE 1966 AUDIENCE OF THE NEW YORK STATE MUSEUM

AN EVALUATION OF THE MUSEUM'S VISITORS PROGRAM

conducted jointly by

The New York State Education Department

and

Janus Museums Consultants, Limited
Toronto, Canada

January 1968

The University of the State of New York
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Division of Evaluation
Albany, New York 12224

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Regents of the University (with years when terms expire)

1968 Edgar W. Couper, A.B., LL.D., L.H.D., Chancellor ---------- Binghamton

1970 Everett J. Penny, B.C.S., D.C.S., Vice Chancellor ---------- White Plains

1978 Alexander J. Allan, Jr., LL.D., Litt.D. ---------- Troy

1973 Charles W. Millard, Jr., A.B., LL.D. ---------- Buffalo

1972 Carl H. Pforzheimer, Jr., A.B., M.B.S., D.C.S. ---------- Purchase

1975 Edward M. M. Warburg, B.S., L.H.D. ---------- New York

1969 Joseph W. McGovern, A.B., LL.B., L.H.D., LL.D. ---------- New York

1977 Joseph T. King, A.B., LL.B. ---------- Queens

1974 Joseph C. Indelicato, M.D. ---------- Brooklyn

1976 Mrs. Helen B. Power, A.B., Litt.D. ---------- Rochester

1979 Francis W. McGinley, B.S., LL.B. ---------- Glens Falls

1981 George D. Weinstein, LL.B. ---------- Hempstead

1971 Kenneth B. Clark, A.B., M.S., Ph.D. ---------- Hastings on Hudson

1982 Stephen K. Bailey, A.B., B.A., M.A., Ph.D., LL.D. ---------- Syracuse

President of the University and Commissioner of Education
James E. Allen, Jr.

Deputy Commissioner of Education
Ewald B. Nyquist

Associate Commissioner for Cultural Education
Hugh M. Flick

Assistant Commissioner for State Museum and [illegible]ence Service
William N. Fenton

Director, Division of Museum Services
G. Carroll Lindsay

Associate Commissioner for Research and Evaluation
Lorne H. Woollatt

Assistant Commissioner for Research and Evaluation
William D. Firman

Director, Division of Research
Carl E. Wedekind

Director, Division of Evaluation
Alan G. Robertson

ED 044621

FOREWORD

The feasibility of conducting a study of the visitors' program in the New York State Museum was the first to be placed on the agenda of the new Department Programs Evaluation.

Hugh Flick, Associate Commissioner for Cultural Education and William Fenton, Assistant Commissioner for the State Museum and Science Service noted a number of studies which were geared to ascertaining the objectives of museum visitors as well as the little-discussed items which tend to hinder or make such visits rewarding.

One such study had been conducted in the Royal Ontario Museum (ROM), reports of which were concluded in 1959, 1960 and 1961. It was felt that the Canadian museum and the New York State Museum had enough similarities to warrant a parallel study in New York State. The ROM study might be used not only as a check against findings but also as a guide for providing appropriate questions.

The Division of Evaluation outlined a base study while the Museum staff made several recommendations dealing with the scope of the study and provided a list of possible consultants.

Duncan Cameron who directed the study of the Royal Ontario Museum located in Toronto agreed to be consultant. By January 1, 1966 a questionnaire had been devised and field tested, interviewers had been selected and trained, turnstiles had been installed at the museum entrance and the project got underway. As the study became more involved the State made application to the Federal government for funding through Title V, ESEA 1965.

The completed report will be helpful to the State Museum staff as it prepares for a move to new quarters in the Cultural Center located in Albany's South Mall. Its findings as well as the findings for the Royal Ontario

Museum will be available for other large museums and may be of special interest to those located in the State's Big Six Cities. Theoretically, the resulting three pronged approach to similar questions posed in three completely different settings will have yielded answers which may not have been arrived at through a comprehensive study in any single museum.

Lorne H. Woollatt

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	INTERPRETATION AND COMMENT	I
I	THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	1
II	ORGANIZATION	2
III	RESEARCH DESIGN	3
IV	THE QUESTIONNAIRE	5
V	TABULATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS	7
VI	ANNUAL ATTENDANCE AND THE SAMPLE	8
VII	GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF THE RESPONDENTS AND COMPARISONS WITH CENSUS DATA	11
VIII	CHARACTERISTICS OF THE MUSEUM VISITORS	13
	1. Size of Groups	13
	2. Sex	14
	3. Age	15
	4. The Student Visitors	17
	5. The Education of Non-Student Visitors	19
	6. Occupation	20
	7. Family Income	22
	8. Place of Residence	24
IX	VISITOR BEHAVIOR	25
	1. The Orientation of New Local Residents	25
	2. First-Time Visitors	25
	3. Visiting Frequency and Recency	27
	4. Activity Prior to Museum Visit	28
	5. Government Employees	29
	6. Employment Locale	30
	7. Transportation	30
	8. Response to Promotion	31
	9. Length of Visit	32
	10. Circumstances of First Visit	33
	11. Preference in Types of Museum	34
	12. Reasons for Visit "Today"	34
	13. Activities Related to the Museum Visit	35
	14. Mass Media Habits of Visitors	36

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd)

X VISITOR ATTITUDES AND EVALUATIONS 37

1. Expectation and Fulfillment 37
2. Visitor Preference in Visiting Hours 37
3. Museum Content Preferences 38
4. The New York State Museum Compared with Other Museums 40
5. Evaluations Following Museum Visit 41

REFERENCES 44

APPENDICES

A. Questionnaires Used in the 1966 New York State Museum Audience Study 45

B. Questionnaires Used in the 1958 Royal Ontario Museum Audience Study 55

INTERPRETATION AND COMMENT

The audience of the New York State Museum, unlike that of the Royal Ontario Museum (ROM), cannot be described as a combination of a representative cross-section of the regional population and of regional tourist traffic. The New York State Museum appears to have an important clientele who tend to be well-educated, from the upper socio-economic level. These are regular visitors who live close to the Capitol centre and they are professionals or the wives and children of professionals. Among them, males outnumber females and there is an over-representation of university students.

The data suggest that the Museum is an effective tourist attraction and also has good penetration of the immediate (Albany County) community, in spite of the factors noted above. The lack of efficient publicity, and the awkward location of the museum are both problems, however, and the fact that those with minimal education (elementary school or less) are nominally represented in the audience, although they comprise a third of the State population, cannot be ignored. There is evidence to suggest that the Museum, as it presently exists, caters unwittingly to the literate minority and does not provide excitement or interpretation of exhibits for the less literate majority. The success as a tourist attraction must also be considered in the light of the Museum's proximity to the Capitol buildings which are understood to be a well-publicized and promoted attraction for tours and in-State tourism.

The effectiveness of the present Museum in building its clientele must be questioned. Nineteen per cent of the audience (who have visited previously in the last twelve months) account for more than half of the visits or traffic. Forty-three per cent of the respondents were first-time visitors and 38 per cent had been to the Museum before, but not in the last year. Of this latter group, 65 per cent made their first visit in 1959, a year of special celebration. From

these data, one might guess that, for most, the New York State Museum is a one-time experience, and that the clientele are the literate elite with special interests.

Three-quarters of the frequent visitors--the hard core of the clientele--expected to spend an hour or less in the Museum, compared with one-half of the total sample.

In the light of these comments, it is suggested that the Museum, once visited, is reason for subsequent visits for a minority only, and that these come for specific reasons established on the basis of the initial experience.

The subsequent preferences expressed by the sub-sample interviewed at the end of their visits appear to enforce this view. Two-thirds of those respondents were most interested in either anthropology or mammalogy, the two subject areas employing the diorama technique.

Fewer than one in ten were most interested in the Museum's newest and most glamourous gallery--palaeontology.

It would be worthwhile to consider the possibility that visitors return to museums to see again specific exhibits which have lasting appeal and that, in the New York State Museum, the Iroquois and mammal group dioramas are such exhibits.

Some criticisms of the New York State Museum derived from several parts of the study are of note. Of those who thought the Museum "worse" than other science museums they had visited, more than half complained that the exhibits were not varied enough. Those who were critical in the agree-disagree scaling of thirteen statements about the Museum appeared to want more effective interpretation of exhibits and also felt that there was lack of publicity and that the Museum was in an awkward location.

The lack of publicity also showed up when tourists were asked how they had heard about the Museum. Two-thirds reported "word of mouth" sources, about

one-quarter mentioned posters and brochures and only 1 per cent mentioned press, radio or television.

The study was designed to test several hypotheses, one being that the audience contained an important segment of government employees and persons who happened to be in the Education Building for other reasons.

In other words, the Museum visit was a product of proximity and spare time, especially lunch hours. This hypothesis is not supported by the study. In spite of the criticisms and the biases in audience composition noted above, the Museum's visitors tend to be bone fide visitors who want to see the Musem, rather than "drop-ins" or time killers.

In considering plans for the new Museum in the South Mall Cultural Center, two inferences from the study are thought to be of special importance:

1. There are "spectaculars" which bring some visitors back again and again, such as the Iroquois dioramas. Such permanent exhibits of outstanding quality, though expensive to produce, may be vital to the building and holding of a clientele.
2. The remarkable success of 1959 in bringing in new, first-time visitors, and criticisms that exhibits are not varied enough, suggest that special exhibitions of a topical or current interest type may be the essential factor in introducing the museum to segments of the population not otherwise reached.

I. THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of the study reported here is to provide the New York State Museum with a profile, or definition, of its audience during 1966. This profile has two principal uses:

a. It provides a baseline, or benchmark, from which the Museum may survey its audience in the future and from which changes in the audience profile may be studied and trends projected.

b. It provides data which permit evaluation of the current operation of the Museum in terms of its stated objectives.

It should be noted that this study is concerned only with the voluntary or casual visitor, and not with the organized groups such as school classes, which represent an important segment of the Museum's total audience.

The use of this study as a benchmark is of particular importance since the Museum, now housed in the State Education Building, is soon to move into new quarters in the South Mall Cultural Center. It can reasonably be predicted that the new location and much improved quarters will influence the Museum's audience, both in terms of volume and composition. Without the present study, these changes would not be measurable.

The use of the data and interpretations presented here for immediate evaluation of present operations is also related to the Museum's future, for it may assist those responsible for planning the new museum by revealing strengths and weaknesses in the present museum.

II. ORGANIZATION

The study was conducted by the Division of Research and Evaluation of the State Education Department which was responsible for research design, questionnaire construction, sample design, the actual field work or interviewing questionnaire editing, coding and the transfer of data to IBM key-punch cards.

Janus Museum Consultants Limited served as consultants to the Division during the planning and field work phases, arranged for computer tabulation of the data at Toronto and for the preparation of this present report.

Throughout, close liaison was maintained with the New York State Museum, which is an integral part of the State Education Department, and which had initially requested that the study be undertaken.

III. RESEARCH DESIGN

At the request of the Director of the New York State Museum, the research design followed that used at the Royal Ontario Museum for a comparable study in 1958. (1)

Essentially, the design calls for the random sampling of visitors to the museum as they arrive for their visits. The sampling procedure allows for variations resulting from time of day, day of week, and season of year. Thus, visitors are selected by a random process at all times during open hours, all days of the week and over the period of twelve months.

After study of the 1958 ROM sample, a comparable design was prepared by the Bureau of Statistics of the State Education Department. To our knowledge, this was modified only in that interviewing during the late afternoon on weekdays was cancelled after the study was in progress. This modification resulted from minimal incoming visitor traffic which made completion of interview quotas impossible.

The random selection procedure was the same as that used at the ROM. The interviewer, coming on duty at the beginning of an assigned interview period, would turn to the first group of one or more persons entering the museum and ask, "How many are there in your group?" The person replying to this question then became the respondent for the interview and was asked questions about both the group and himself.

On completion of the interview, the interviewer would then turn to the museum entrance once again and address herself to the next group of one or more arriving. This process was continued until the quota (number) of interviews assigned for that period had been completed.

The sample size was set at 1,500 and, as reported below, this provided a 1 per cent sample of the visiting population, with 1,544 interviews actually completed and included in tabulation.

An important feature of the design, and one not found in the ROM study, was the addition of a second questionnaire to be completed by one-third of the respondents at the conclusion of their visits. Where the basic questionnaire was concerned with the characteristics of the audience and expectations, the supplementary questionnaire was concerned with evaluation.

The first part of the supplementary questionnaire was administered by the interviewer, as was the basic questionnaire. The second part was self-administered and required evaluation of thirteen statements about the museum, each on a six-point scale.

Of the 1,544 respondents to the basic questionnaire, 559, (over 36 per cent), completed the supplementary questionnaire.

The questionnaires are presented as Appendix A to this report, and are discussed in detail in the section following.

It should be noted that this study does not deal with school-aged children who visited the Museum as part of school-organized groups. During the study more than 25,000 such children visited the Museum with their teachers. These children participated in the formal education program provided by the Museum.

In other words their visits were arranged around specific exhibits which were discussed prior to the visit by a member of the Museum's staff in one of the Museum's classrooms.

IV. THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The original intent, when planning for this study began in 1965, was to replicate the Royal Ontario Museum 1958 questionnaire so that a maximum of the data could be compared. (See Appendix B.) The questionnaires used in New York State are considerably different from the ROM schedules, however, and for good reason.

In the ROM study, it was found that some questions, i.e., home ownership, (Appendix B - Q.7), yielded no useful data and should not be repeated. Others, such as the mass media questions (Q.10), or the club membership question (Q.11), applied only to the Toronto situation. Similarly, certain New York State questions such as Q.s 3d, 5b,c, 6a,b,c, (Appendix A.) are specific to Albany and the Capitol District.

The development of comparative data was also complicated by the differing census methods of Canada's Dominion Bureau of Statistics and the United States' Bureau of the Census. In each study, an attempt was made to gather visitor data which could be related to local census data. The result is that comparisons od demographic characteristics in this report are frequently based on rather free interpolation.

Other questions, i.e. Appendix A, Q.2e, were derived from other museum studies which had produced useful data.

Generally, the questionnaire proved efficient in application. However, one or two problems should be noted.

New York State Question 4c, "What do you expect to get out of your visit to this museum?" was pre-coded into four responses, (1. general information/ knowledge, 2. cultural enrichment, 3. educational exposure, 4. enjoyment), plus an open-end "other", following the pretest of the questionnaire in which 4c was open-end and verbatim responses were recorded. Unfortunately, the four

pre-coded categories are not mutually exclusive and are so general that limited value must be placed on the results. The fact that 100 per cent of the respondents gave replies which could be entered in the four pre-coded categories, and not one replied so that the response had to be "other" underlines the doubt about the value of this question.

The first question on the supplementary questionnaire, (See Appendix A, Museum Survey 1B), is "If we were planning to change the museum's open hours, which day of the week and what time of day would be most convenient for you personally to visit the Museum?"

The intention was that respondents would specify <u>one</u> day of the week and <u>one</u> time of day which was "most convenient" for them. Unfortunately, multiple responses were accepted from respondents and the resulting data fails to give clear indications of visitors' preferences.

Some mention should also be made of the mass media questions, 6a,b,c. Although the results of these questions, which concern newspaper readership, radio listening and television viewing, are reported here, they are not interpreted. It is felt that interpretation must be left to the museum staff who will best understand the implications of these data.

V. TABULATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

This study was administered by the Division of Research and Evaluation, New York State Department of Education, as noted above, and the coding, editing and keypunching were done at Albany.

No verification of keypunching was carried out, but preliminary computer tabulation of total scores showed that keypunching could be assumed to be accurate, the cards being free of all but a few extraneous punches, i.e., not pre-coded or allowed for by available alternatives. Computer tabulation was carried out in Toronto by Statistical Reporting and Tabulating Limited who, using the punched cards supplied by New York State, produced the data from which the tables in this study were prepared and the analysis done. Copies of the computer output, or raw data, are not appended to this report but are on file in the Division of Research and Evaluation and at Janus offices in Toronto.

The only test of significance used in this study was the "chi square". When the term 'significant' is used in the analysis, it refers to data that is significant at the .05 level. That is, the odds are only one in twenty that the occurance referred to in the data occured by chance.

VI. ANNUAL ATTENDANCE AND THE SAMPLE

During the 12-month period of the study, (1966), three turnstiles were installed at the entrance to the Museum, one for staff, one for adults and one for children. It is these latter two groups from which the sample was drawn. A separate entrance was arranged for organized groups and school classes. Because of the traffic at certain times of the day, it was difficult to direct the flow through the correct turnstiles.

To check the accuracy of the turnstile count, a hand count of people entering the museum was taken on four different days and compared to the turnstile figures.

The figures were then corrected by taking the differences between the hand count and turnstile figures for the same period and adjusting the gross figures accordingly. These data are presented in Table 1, which illustrates the "attendance figure correction procedure."

TABLE 1

ATTENDANCE FIGURE CORRECTION PROCEDURE

	Staff	Visitors
Total turnstile count for study	23,911	260,109
Turnstile count for four days	83	1,278
Hand count for same four days	10	1,131

Correction for staff figures:

10/83 x 23,911 = 2881 actual staff admissions

excess from staff turnstile count = 21,030

21,030 added to visitor count = 281,139 visitor admissions

Correction for visitor figures:

1,313/1,278 x 281,139 = 248,801 actual visitor admissions

This resulted in a staff traffic figure for the year of 2,881 after the count for the "staff" turnstile was corrected to remove as many visitors as possible who passed through this turnstile in error. The figure of 2,881 is accepted as a reasonably accurate estimate of staff using the turnstile over the year.

The visiting figure corrected in the same manner as the staff figure shows 247,402 visits by people other than staff or organized groups and tours.

The results of Q.2 (Appendix A), on visiting frequency, show an average of 1.75 visits per respondent per year. When this figure is divided into the number of visits, it produces as estimate of the annual number of visitors, 142,172.

There were 1,544 interviews completed for this study. The sample is, then, approximately 1 per cent of the visiting population.

VII. GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF THE RESPONDENTS AND COMPARISONS WITH CENSUS DATA

Respondents were asked which state or country they resided in and, if in New York State, which county. The tabulations show that 84 per cent of the respondents are from New York State and the remainder (16 per cent) from 35 other states and 20 foreign countries. Since the segment of the sample living outside New York State is so widely distributed and is only a small segment of the total sample, it was not removed from the total sample for comparisons with the total New York State census figures.

Of the 84 per cent New York State visitors, 56 per cent of them are from the Capitol District which was, for this study, a seven-county area around the capitol, as shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION OF CAPITOL DISTRICT VISITORS BY COUNTY

County	Per cent of Capitol District Visitors
Albany	58
Rensselaer	16
Saratoga	9
Schenectady	12
Schoharie	1
Warren	3
Washington	1
	100

Other counties producing over 2 per cent of the State audience are:

-- Columbia

-- Nassau

-- Metropolitan New York City counties of Richmond, Bronx, Kings, Queens and New York

-- Suffolk

In this report, then, comparisons are between visitors' characteristics and those reported for New York State by the Bureau of the Census (2). Where Capitol District Resident visitors are compared with census data, the census of the seven counties listed in Table 2 is used.

VIII. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE MUSEUM VISITORS

1. Size of Groups

Question 1a, at the beginning of the interview, determined the proportion of visitors coming to the museum alone, with one other person, and so forth, as shown in Table 3 below:

TABLE 3

SIZE OF GROUPS VISITING
THE NEW YORK STATE MUSEUM
AND THE ROYAL ONTARIO MUSEUM

Size of Group	NYSM	ROM
came alone	24%	31%
came with one person	38	36
came with two persons	15	16
came with three or more persons	23	17
	100%	100%

It should be noted that the visitors to the New York State Museum tend to come in groups of 4 or more to a greater extent (+6%) than do the Royal Ontario Museum visitors, and conversely the individual visitor is more common (+7%) to the Royal Ontario Museum.

Both frequent visitors* and students at the New York State Museum exhibit behavior contrary to this over-all pattern for New York State Museum, as shown in Table 4:

TABLE 4

SIZE OF STUDENT AND FREQUENT VISITOR
GROUPS AT THE NEW YORK STATE MUSEUM

Size of group	Students	Frequent visitors
came alone	31%	40%
came with one person	50	44
came with two persons	14	6
came with three or more persons	5	10
	100%	100%

* Frequent visitors are those who made 6 or more visits in the 12 months preceding their interviews.

The marked tendancy of students and frequent visitors to come alone or with one other person indicates that the balance of the visiting population tends to visit in larger groups than Table 3 suggests. One might speculate that the more serious visitor (frequent and student) has learned that effective use of the museum exhibit is facilitated by either visiting alone or with one other person. Borhegyi (3) has suggested that the diad pair is of special significance in museum visiting behavior, and Cameron and Abbey (4) have discussed the one-to-one relationship of visitor and exhibit.

It is also thought that most students (78 per cent) come to the museum unaccompanied by adults. It is estimated that 52 per cent of the groups in the total sample contained at least one adult, as compared to only 22 per cent of the student sample*

It was found that 44 per cent of the groups contained no one under 21. That is, 44 per cent of the respondents were over 21 and not accompanying someone under 21.

2. Sex

The survey was conducted by interviewing the spontaneous spokesman for each group of one or more visitors approached. The data collected by Question 1a was the number of adult males and females in the group, plus the number of persons under 21. The sex of the respondent/spokesman was recorded separately by the interviewer at the conclusion of the interview. Table 5 compares the sex distribution in respondents, all adults in groups, New York State and in the ROM study.

---

* Interpolation from Question 1a where students were accompanied by adults.

TABLE V

SEX DISTRIBUTION IN RESPONDENTS, ALL ADULTS IN GROUPS, NEW YORK STATE AND IN THE ROM STUDY

Sex	NYSM Respondents	All adults in group	New York State Census	ROM Respondents	ROM Groups	Toronto Census
male	54%	50%	49%	58%	51%	49%
female	46	50	51	42	49	51
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

In both studies, the male:female ratio in groups approximates the local census data, but the respondent samples contain an over-representation of males. This is probably due to the tendancy of males to act as spokesmen when accompanying females.

It is not thought that this over-representation introduces any serious bias into the study. It might be assumed from the group data that neither males nor females tend to visit the museum more than the other, but examination of a sub-sample raises doubts.

Of the frequent visitors, who represent 4 per cent of visitors, but 21 per cent of visits during the study year, 73 per cent are males. This would suggest that either (2) the present museum lacks content which will sustain the interest of females over repeated visits or (b) that the museum content is specifically of interest to male visitors.

3. Age

The distribution of ages in the respondent sample is significantly different from that in New York State, with gross under-representation of those 7-14 and over 50, and a marked over-representation of those in the 15-24 age range. This is compared with the ROM findings, below. Where the New York State Museum has a 17 per cent over-representation in the 15-24 group,

the ROM has 9 per cent. The ROM did not have serious under-representation of those over 50 years of age.

TABLE 6

AGE DISTRIBUTIONS IN RESPONDENT SAMPLE
IN NEW YORK STATE AND FROM ROYAL ONTARIO MUSEUM STUDY

Ages	Respondent Sample	New York State Census		ROM Sample	Toronto Census
7-14	3%	16%	(0-14)	9%	18%
15-24	31	14		24	15
25-34	23	15		24	22
35-49	30	24		26	26
50 +	13	31		15	19
no answer	--	--		2	--
	100%	100%		100%	100%

In both studies, the under-representation of the young under-14's is now thought to be a result of the method of selecting respondents. Where a child of 14 or under is accompanied by an adult, the adult will, in our opinion, become the spokesman. This is supported by Table 7, in which age distribution in groups is inferred from the reported level of education, (Question 1b) and is compared with census data.

TABLE 7

ESTIMATED AGE DISTRIBUTION OF GROSS SAMPLE UNDER 21

School Level	Gross Sample Under 21	Estimated Age	New York State Census
Pre-school	14%	under 5	29%
Elementary	49	5-13	45
Secondary	20	14-17	17
University	13		
Post Graduate	1) 17	18-20	9
Other	3)		
	100%		100%

It should be noted that under-representation of the 7-14 group is not true of the visiting population, as estimated above, but only of the respondent sample. Table 7 also suggests that the over-representation in the 15-24 age range occurs in the upper half of the range.

The age distribution in the museum visiting population is thus thought to be comparable with that in New York State, with the exception of the very young and those over 50, who are under-represented, and those in the 18-24 range who are over-represented.

4. The Student Visitors

Question 1b ascertained the level of education for those in the gross sample under 21 and still in school. Table 8 shows these data compared with New York State census data for school enrollment and with the education level for student respondents.

TABLE 8

EDUCATION LEVEL OF GROSS SAMPLE UNDER 21,
STUDENT RESPONDENTS, AND NEW YORK STATE CENSUS FOR SCHOOL ENROLLMENT

Educational Level	Gross Sample under 21	Student Respondents	New York State Census*
Elementary	61%	14%	67%
Secondary	25	41	24
University	14	45	9
	100%	100%	100%

It appears that the Museum's visiting population of students is a cross-section of those in school in the State, with some over-representation of university students. The respondent sample has a severe under-representation of elementary school students. This is consistent with age distributions on

* These data include university students (3% ± 1%) between the ages 21-34.

which comment has been made in a previous section.

Table 9 compares the education level of student respondents at the New York State Museum and the ROM with local census data.

TABLE 9

EDUCATION LEVELS OF STUDENT RESPONDENTS AT THE NEW YORK STATE MUSEUM AND THE ROYAL ONTARIO MUSEUM

	NEW YORK STATE MUSEUM		ROYAL ONTARIO MUSEUM	
Education Level	Student Respondents	New York State Census	Student Respondents	Toronto Census
Elementary	14%	67%	35%	79%
Secondary	41	24	19	17
University	45	9	46	4
	100%	100%	100%	100%

As suggested earlier, the gross under-representation of respondents at the elementary school level is thought to be a result of the sampling procedure. It is of note, however, that the ROM sample has less severe under-representation of elementary students but similar over-representation of university students. When it is remembered that the ROM is on a campus of 25,000 students and is a university museum as well as a public museum, the New York State Museum results become even more interesting.

The comparisons in Table 9, for student respondents, when coupled with gross sample data shown in Table 8 seems to leave little doubt that university students make more use of the museum than would be predicted on the basis of census data. Table 10 attempts to indicate the extent to which university students are over-represented by removing the sampling bias of the elementary school segment.

TABLE 10

SECONDARY SCHOOL AND UNIVERSITY STUDENT VISITORS
IN NEW YORK STATE AND TORONTO

	NEW YORK STATE MUSEUM			ROYAL ONTARIO MUSEUM	
Education Level	Gross Sample (under 21)	Student Respondents	New York State Census	Student Respondents	Toronto Census
Secondary	64%	47%	73%	30%	80%
University	36	53	27	70	20
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

It can now be seen that both museums have an over-representation of university students among respondents, the ROM being the more extreme case. While this may be due, in part, to sampling bias, the distribution of students under 21 in the gross sample reflects the same situation, even though university students 21 and over are excluded.

Without further calculation, then, it seems reasonable to underline the earlier statement that the New York State Museum attracts an important university student audience, well beyond that which would be predicted on the basis of census data.

5. The Education of Non-Student Visitors

Table 11 presents data on the education achievement levels of respondents no longer in school, compared with census data.

TABLE 11

EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENT LEVELS OF NON-STUDENT VISITORS TO THE
NEW YORK STATE MUSEUM AND THE ROYAL ONTARIO MUSEUM, COMPARED WITH LOCAL CENSUS DATA

	NEW YORK STATE MUSEUM		ROYAL ONTARIO MUSEUM	
Education Achievement Level	Non-Student Respondents	New York State Census	Non-Student Respondents	Toronto Census
Elementary school or less	3%	36%	16%	32%
Secondary school	48	47	42	55
University	49	17	1	12
Undetermined	--	--	1	1
	100%	100%	100%	100%

In interpreting Table 11, two factors must be kept in mind. First, bias due to sampling method is unlikely to influence these data, since respondents no longer in school can be assumed to be over 16 years of age, and those 17-50 are not under-represented in the respondent sample. Second, some exaggeration on the part of the respondents can be assumed when they report educational achievement. Such false and exaggerated claims would not, in our opinion, produce the results above but, at most, would inflate them slightly.

On this basis, it can be said that both the New York State Museum and the Royal Ontario Museum appear to attract a visiting population with a higher mean education achievement level than exists in the regional population. More specifically, a significantly larger proportion of persons who have attended university visits the museum than would be predicted on the basis of census data.

Of equal importance is the fact that persons with minimal education (elementary or less) are insignificant (3 per cent) in the New York State Museum audience, although such persons constitute more than one-third of the State population.

6. Occupation

Question 8 provides data on (a) the occupations of all respondents and (b) the occupations of the heads of the households of all respondents. These are presented in Table 12.

TABLE 12

OCCUPATIONS OF RESPONDENTS
AND OF RESPONDENTS' HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS

Occupation	Respondents	Heads of Households
Professional	32%	53%
Clerical	9	9
Service	2	2
Agricultural	1	1
Skilled Labor	7	19
Semi-skilled Labor	2	5
Unskilled Labor	1	1
Student	21	1
Housewife	19	1
Unemployed	5	5
Retired	3	3
	100%	100%

The data for occupations of heads of households is useful when compared with labor force census data, for it reflects the socioeconomic backgrounds of visitors, including housewives and students. The respondent data reveal the proportions of visitors who are employed, students, or housewives.

Note that "Head of Households", below, includes those "Respondents" who are themselves heads of households.

Most significant is the predominance of professionals and the wives and student children of professionals among museum visitors. This is underlined by the comparisons with the New York State labor force presented in Table 13 below.

TABLE 13

OCCUPATIONS OF RESPONDENTS AND HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS
IN THE LABOR FORCE, COMPARED WITH THE NEW YORK STATE LABOR FORCE

Occupation	Heads of Households	Respondents	New York State Census
Professional	58%	59%	24%
Clerical	11	17	27
Service	3	4	12
Agriculture	1	1	1
Skilled Labor	21	13	13
Semi-Skilled Labor	5	4	19
Unskilled Labor	1	1	4
	100%	100%	100%

The data in Table 13 make clear the over-representation of professionals and those from homes where the head of household is a professional. The over-representation of heads of households who are skilled laborers is also of note. This appears to be consistent with the education achievement data presented in an earlier section.

Comparison of the distribution of occupations among visitors at the New York State Museum and at the Royal Ontario Museum is not possible, due to different census classification systems in Canada and the United States. Table 14, below, shows those direct comparisons which are possible.

TABLE 14

COMPARISON OF SOME OCCUPATION CATEGORIES FOR
NEW YORK STATE MUSEUM AND ROYAL ONTARIO MUSEUM RESPONDENTS

Occupations	New York State Museum	Royal Ontario Museum
Employed	52%	53%
Student	21	25
Housewife	19	18
Unemployed	5	2
Retired	3	2
	100%	100%

7. Family Income

New York State Question 10 asked the respondent to indicate in which of nine total family income categories his own family belonged. The responses have been compared with New York State census data in Table 15 and the distribution for the Capitol District visitors has also been compared to census data.

TABLE 15

FAMILY INCOME DISTRIBUTION AMONG VISITORS TO
THE NEW YORK STATE MUSEUM COMPARED TO THE NEW YORK STATE CENSUS*

Family Income	Total Respondents	New York State Census	Capitol District Respondents	Capitol District Census
under $3,000	3%	14%	2%	16%
$3,000 - $3,999	5	8	6	9
$4,000 - $4,999	6	11	8	12
$5,000 - $6,999	18	24	20	26
$7,000 and over	68	43	64	37
	100%	100%	100%	100%

These data are consistent with the reported education and occupations of respondents, adding strength to the argument that the New York State Museum audience contains a gross over-representation of the well-educated, upper socio-economic strata in the regional population.

The income data can be assumed to be somewhat inflated through false and exaggerated responses. One might argue that the out-of-town and out-of-state visitors inflated the total sample data, since tourists tend to be more affluent than the population at large. The consistency between the total sample and the Capitol District sub-sample makes it clear that high income tourists are not an explanation. Further, inflation through exaggerated claims would not, in our opinion, account for more than a fraction of the over representation.

There is no ROM data which can be compared directly with Table 15, since individual incomes only were recorded in that study. It may be of interest to note, however, that there was only 9 per cent over-representation in the $7,000+ group in the ROM study, (Metro heads of households (1958) incomes), as compared with 27 per cent in the New York State study (Capitol District family incomes).

* Respondents declining to answer Q.10 are excluded from these tabulations. These constitute 14 per cent of the total sample.

8. Place of Residence

As reported in Section VII, 84 per cent of the respondents live in New York State and half of these (56 per cent) live in the Capitol District. Of the Capitol District visitors, 58 per cent live in Albany County. The 16 per cent of visitors living outside New York State have widely distributed places of residence over 36 other states and 20 foreign countries.

TABLE 16

PLACE OF RESIDENCE OF MUSEUM VISITORS

Place of Residence	New York State Museum	Royal Ontario Museum
Capitol District or Metropolitan Toronto	48%	62%
Other New York State or Province of Ontario	36	23
Out of State/Province	16	15
	100%	100%

As shown in Table 16, the geographic distribution of visitors to the New York State Museum varies significantly from that at the ROM, with the Toronto museum having a larger proportion of local resident visitors. This may be accounted for by an one of a dozen factors, i.e. location, size of museum, size or urban area, etc.

No meaningful interpretation of the difference is possible, since the two museums and the two urban areas are not directly comparable. It does seem reasonable to say that the New York State Museum appears to be effective in attracting both local residents and tourists.

IX. VISITOR BEHAVIOR

1. The Orientation of New Local Residents

In the Royal Ontario Museum study, it was reported that persons who had lived in Toronto less than two years were over-represented among museum visitors. Where 9 per cent of Metro Toronto residents had lived in Metro two years of less, 26 per cent of museum visitors interviewed had lived in Metro for this short period of time.

Comparable data are not available for length of residence in the Capitol District, but a similar pattern may obtain in Albany. Eighteen per cent of all Capitol District residents visiting were new residents, (2 years or less). Since the New York State census reports that only 14 per cent of the State urban and rural (non-farm) residents have moved from out of their home counties in the 5 years preceding the census, it seems likely that the per centage of persons who have moved into the Capitol District from other counties in the two years preceding their museum interviews would be considerably less than 18 per cent of the Capitol District population.

If this is so, the data support the hypothesis that new residents visit the sights and places of interest as part of their orientation to the new community.

(When it is recalled that Metropolitan Toronto, at the time of the ROM study, was the fastest-growing urban area in North America, the argument above seems even more plausible.)

2. First Time Visitors

Forty-three per cent of all respondents were making their first visit to the New York State Museum. The ROM study reports only 24 per cent first-time visitors.

The first-time visitors, as might be expected, are primarily (79 per cent) persons living outside the Capitol District. Of the Royal Ontario Museum's first-timers, 64 per cent lived outside Metro Toronto.

Of the new visitors to the New York State Museum, almost half (43 per cent) were vacationing and sight-seeing, while 27 per cent came directly to the museum from home. It is of note that, of the 21 per cent of first-timers who did live in the Capitol District, 41 per cent were new residents as compared with the 18 per cent of all Capitol District resident visitors who had lived there two years or less.

Since the proportion of the total audiences visiting the museum for the first time is so high, it deserves special examination.

Firstly, these first-time visitors, represent 43 per cent of respondents and also account for 44 per cent of visitors in the gross sample, if we assume that all of those accompanying first-time respondents were also first-time visitors.

Secondly, the first-time visitors represent only 24 per cent of visits made to the museum. (All others are repeat visitors, many of whom make several visits to the museum during the year.)

To see these first-time visitors in perspective, Table 17, below, shows a comparison of visits versus visitors in terms of visiting frequency and recency.

TABLE 17

VISITS AND VISITORS COMPARED FOR FREQUENCY AND RECENCY OF VISITS TO THE NEW YORK STATE MUSEUM

Frequency and Recency of Visits	% of visits in 1966	% of gross visitor sample	% of respondent sample
first time	24%	44%	43%
last visited more than 5 years ago	9	18	16
last visited 1-5 years ago	12	21	22
visited less than 6 times in past 12 mos.	34	14	15
visited 6 or more times in past 12 mos.	21	3	4
	100%	100%	100%

Table 17 makes clear the importance of distinguishing between visitors and visits. Where first-time visitors represent 42 per cent of visitors, and frequent visitors (6 or more visits in 12 months) represent 4 per cent of visitors, these groups account for 24 per cent and 21 per cent respectively of visits or, if you wish, of visitor traffic.

3. Visiting Frequency and Recency

Table 17, above, shows the important distinction between visits and visitors. Here we are concerned with a more detailed examination of visitors, in terms of frequency and recency of visits, based on respondent data.

The Royal Ontario Museum study showed that the average number of visits per visitor per year was slightly more than two. In Albany, the median is slightly less than two.

Reference to Table 17 shows that the approximate 2 visits per year median can be misleading. Fifty-f[illegible]er cent of visits are accounted for by the 19 per cent of respondents who had visited the New York State Museum in the 12 months prior to the interviews and an additional 21 per cent of visits were accounted for by the 43 per cent of first-time visitors. It seems reasonable to say that the museum has a 19 per cent "clientele" of regular visitors who account for more than half of the museum traffic, while the 81 per cent "casual" visitors account for less than half of the traffic.

The first visits of the casual visitor are of special interest.

TABLE 18

FIRST VISITS OF THOSE WHO HAD BEEN TO THE MUSEUM BEFORE, BUT NOT IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS

First Visit	Casual Visitors*	
1-2 years ago	1%	
2-3 years ago	9	
3-4 years ago	6	
4-5 years ago	4	
5-6 years ago	3	
6-7 years ago	6	
7-8 years ago	65	(1959)
8-9 years ago	2	
9 + years ago	4	
	100%	

*excluding "first-time" and "frequent" visitors

The 65 per cent of respondents who had visited the New York State Museum before their interviews, and who first visited in 1959, was thought at first to be an error in tabulation or a phenomenon of recall. It is understood, however, that 1959 was a year of celebration in Albany, being the 350th Hudson-Champlain anniversary, that there were many special events and unusually heavy tourism. The significance of these data should be considered carefully by museum staff who remember the 1959 year, for it appears that the particular combination of promotion and events were unusually successful.

4. Activity Prior to Museum Visit

All respondents were asked, "Where were you today just before you came to the museum?" One purpose of this question was to test the hypothesis that a large proportion of regular or frequent visitors come to the museum while in the Education Building for some other purpose.

Table 19 presents the responses of the total respondent sample and four sub-samples.

TABLE 19

VISITORS' ACTIVITY PRIOR TO MUSEUM VISIT

Activity	Total Respondents		Out of Town Respondents		Capitol District Respondents		First-Time Visitors		Frequent Visitors	
At home	38%		22%		57%		27%		44%	
Vacation or sightseeing	27		45		6		43		5	
In Education Department	3)		3)		3)		3)		5)	
In State Library	3)	15%	2)	15%	4)	14%	2)	13%	8)	19
At meeting or conference	9)		10)		7)		8)		6)	
At work elsewhere	6		2		9		3		14	
Shopping	5		5		7		4		5	
At school	5		3		7		3		13	
In hotel or motel	4		7		1		7		--	
Other	1		1		1		1		--	
	100%		100%		100%		100%		100%	

Most of the differences among the total sample and the sub-samples are self-explanatory. It is not surprising, for example, that almost half the out-of-town respondents were sightseeing, nor that more than half of the Capitol District respondents came directly from home.

The pre-visit activities of frequent visitors are of interest. Note that 13 per cent come directly from school, 19 per cent were in the Education Building* and an additional 14 per cent came from work elsewhere. These data support, to some degree, the hypothesis that proximity influences visiting frequency but, when the other sub-samples are reviewed, it is apparent that there is not an unreasonable proportion of the total audience whose visits result from proximity. This statement is supported by the section following.

5. Government Employees

Capitol District resident respondents were asked whether or not they were government employees and at what level they work, Federal, State, or Local.

The data show that 16 per cent of the Capitol District resident, (8 percent) of the total sample), were employed by government. Of these, employment was: 25% Federal; 72% State; 3% Local. This is understandable as Albany is the State capital and has, in addition to the many State Government offices, Federal agency offices.

When this study was designed, one of the hypotheses to be tested was that government employees working close to the museum formed a large and regular clientele of lunch-hour visitors. This is not the case. Only 23 per cent of the frequent visitors are government employees, frequent visitors representing only 4 per cent of the sample and, therefore, this "clientele" is less than 1 per cent of the total sample.

---

* It is assumed that "at a meeting or conference" refers, in most cases, to meetings in the Education Building.

6. Employment Locale

The question, "Do you work within five blocks of the museum?", was asked only of Capitol District resident visitors. The three possible responses, "Yes", "No", and "Don't work", were not read to the respondents and, as a result, 52 per cent of the student respondents answered "No", unaware of the "Don't work" alternative. It is highly improbable that 52 per cent of the students in the study would work either inside or outside a five-block radius of the museum. Thus, by eliminating the "No" and "Don't work" answers and examining the "Yes" responses, we find that only 15 per cent of the total Capitol District respondents work within the five blocks.

Although 28 per cent of the frequent visitors work within the five-block radius, they are only 16 in number in the sample. Further negating the hypothesis mentioned in the previous section, government employees working within five blocks of the museum who are frequent visitors would number about 6 people in a sample of 1,544 -- or less than 1 per cent of visitors.

7. Transportation

Table 20, which reports the modes of transportation used by visitors to the museum, contains no surprises, with more out-of-town visitors driving (+17%) and more Capitol District residents walking or using public transportation (+19%).

TABLE 20

VISITORS' MEANS OF TRANSPORTATION TO MUSEUM

Transportation	Total Sample	Out-of-Town Respondents	Capitol District Respondents
Walked	19%	15%	24%
Took bus	11	7	17
Given ride	9	10	8
Used car	60	68	51
	100%	100%	100%

Sub-sample data show that frequent visitors walk more (44 per cent) than other groups. Also, 18 per cent of students are given rides and only 29 per cent drive.

Where the transportation data are as might be predicted, the data resulting from the second part of Question 3, which concerned parking, are of real interest.

Of the 60 per cent who drove to the museum, 39 per cent reported difficulty in parking. This may be compared with 22 per cent who reported difficulty in the ROM study.

Further, those who expressed parking difficulty represent 23 per cent of the total sample, as compared with 8 per cent of the ROM sample.

The parking problems at the New York State Museum are well-known, but the planners for the new museum should note the high proportion of visitors coming by car and ensure that ease of parking will be a feature of the new location.

8. Response to Promotion

All of those visitors who said that they were vacationing or sightseeing were asked how they had heard about the museum. The interpretation of the responses can best be determined by New York State Museum staff who are aware of the tourist promotion efforts made during 1966.

There are no comparable data reported in the ROM study, although references to Table 8, The Museum Visitor: II - Survey Results, may be of interest.

TABLE 21

HOW THOSE SIGHTSEEING OR ON VACATION HEARD ABOUT THE MUSEUM*

Media	Tourist Respondents	
Radio, TV, Press	1%	
Posters, brochures	27	
Museum Notice Boards	--	
From someone who had visited	40	
School related	4	
Family related	15	66% word of mouth
Peer group related	7	
Other	--	
Not stated	8	

*totals over 100% due to multiple responses

9. Length of Visit

All respondents were asked how long they expected to spend on the museum on the day of the interview.

TABLE 22

ANTICIPATED LENGTH OF VISIT

Anticipated Length of Visit	Total Respondents	First-Time Visitors	Frequent Visitors
less than ½ hour	11%	8%	27%
½ - 1 hour	43	39	48
1 - 2 hours	26	26	22
more than 2 hours	6	5	--
uncertain	14	22	3
	100%	100%	100%

It is of note that frequent visitors expected to spend much less time in the museum than the total sample or first-time visitors, and that no frequent visitor expected to be in the museum more than 2 hours. This would suggest that the frequent visitor comes for a specific purpose, which he accomplishes promptly or, alternately, that he comes for no specific purpose but knows from his experience that he can browse to his satisfaction (or saturation) in a short period of time.

10. Circumstances of First Visit

Previous sections have dealt with the "where" and the "when" of museum visits. This, and the several sections following, are concerned with "why". It would be incorrect to say that these sections discuss motivation. Rather, they discuss circumstances, (as in Section IX, 2, 4 and 6), and expressed motivation or purpose.

Question 2e asked, "With whom did you come on your first visit?". Table 23 compares responses of the total sample, student respondents and non-student respondents.

TABLE 23

CIRCUMSTANCES OF FIRST VISIT TO NEW YORK STATE MUSEUM

	Total Sample	Student Visitors	Non-Student Visitors
came with family member	52%	48%	53%
came with school class	25	32	23
came with friend (peer)	13	15	12
other	10	5	12
	100%	100%	100%

Of special interest is the proportion of visitors who report coming first with their school classes. Note that students, the younger segment of the sample, more frequently reported first contact through school visits. In an unpublished ROM study, (Abbey, Cameron, 1962 - Leisure Patterns in Metro Toronto), it was found that almost half of those under 25 years of age who had been to the ROM came first with a school class, as compared with only a third of those over 25 years of age.

These data may reflect increased museum visits by schools in recent years. Further investigation should be made of the theory that initial contacts through school visits produce regular museum use.

One thing is clear, however. Virtually all visitors reported making their first visit with someone else. The 1962 ROM study cited above showed that only 6 per cent of visitors had come to the museum for the first time by themselves.

11. Preference in Types of Museum

The New York State Museum is essentially a museum of natural science, including anthropology. Visitors (respondents) were asked if they had visited "any other museums" in the past twelve months, how many different museum and "what kinds of museums" they visited most often.

Only half of the respondents (51 per cent) had visited other museums in the previous twelve months. Even among frequent visitors to the New York State Museum, only 62 per cent had visited another museum in the previous year.

Of those who had visited other museums, 33 per cent visited one other, 23 per cent visited two others, 28 per cent visited three others and 16 per cent visited four others.

Part (h) of the question asked all respondents what kinds of museum they visited most often. Only 17 per cent said they visited only the New York State Museum, but 35 per cent mentioned natural history museums. Historical museums and Art museums were cited by 38 per cent and 26 per cent respectively.

These "preferences" would suggest that the proposed integration of history, anthropology and natural science in the South Mall Cultural Center should produce a high interest level. This is supported by data in subsequent sections.

12. Reasons for Visit "Today"

The second part of Question 4a asked:

> "Now would you tell me why you've decided to visit the museum on this particular day?"

This question was pre-coded following the pre-test and, surprisingly, all 1,544 respondents gave answers which suited the five pre-coded possibilities.

The pre-coded "something to do", however, may refer to a child's school project and specific objectives or, alternately, it may refer to a non-specific objective such as "just to fill in time". The results of this question are presented in Table 24, below.

TABLE 24

REASONS GIVEN FOR VISITING "TODAY"

Reason	Total Sample	First-Time Visitors	Student Visitors	Capitol District Residents
to see the exhibits	34%	38%	39%	31%
to show friends/children	27	19	7	34
"something to do"	22	20	35	25
part of a planned program	12	16	12	6
curious	5	7	6	4
	100%	100%	100%	100%

Despite the generality of the categories, it is of note that more first-time visitors come as part of a planned program; that more Capitol District residents come to show someone else the museum; that more students simply come for "something to do".

13. Activities Related to the Museum Visit

It was an hypothesis that some proportion of those entering the museum were there for non-museum visiting purposes, i.e., to visit staff or the Science Service. The response to Question 4d negates this hypothesis with 97 per cent of all respondents saying they had come for "general pleasure and interest" when read the forced-choice list of six possibilities.

Only 1.1 per cent of respondents were visiting museum staff and .8 per cent were visiting the Science Service.

14. Mass Media Habits of Visitors

The data presented below cannot be interpreted except by New York State Museum staff who are familiar with local media and the Museum's promotional activities through these media.

TABLE 25

MASS MEDIA HABITS OF CAPITOL DISTRICT RESIDENT VISITORS

Press*	Capitol District Visitors	Radio**	Capitol District Visitors	Television Channel***	Capitol District Visitors
Albany Times Union	41%	WPTR	47%	10	33%
Knickerbocker News	22	WTRY	42	6	29
Schenectady Gazette	12	WROW	35	13	22
Schenectady Union Star	4	WGY	32	17	3
Troy Record (morning)	2	WABY	6	2	1
Troy Record (evening)	7	WFLY	3	None	12
Other	5	Other	10		
Don't read local paper	7	None			
	100%				100%

* one paper read most frequently was recorded
** Two stations listened to most frequently were recorded
*** one station watched most frequently was recorded

Note:

Local marketing research organization may be able to provide comparative media habits for the seven county Capitol District population.

X. VISITOR ATTITUDES AND EVALUATIONS

1. Expectation and Fulfillment

As noted in Section IV of this report, Question 4c was pre-coded into four most general categories and 100% of responses were entered in these categories which are not mutually exclusive. Our doubts as to the value of the resulting data, and the related Question 2a in the supplementary questionnaire 1B, lead us to present total scores only, and without comment.

TABLE 26

EXPECTATIONS OF RESPONDENTS VISITING THE NEW YORK STATE MUSEUM*

Expectation	Total Respondents
general information/knowledge	39%
cultural enrichment	4
educational exposure	31
enjoyment	34
other	--

*some multiple responses were accepted. Thus, scores total more than 100%.

One-third of those interviewed on entering the museum completed supplementary questionnaires at the end of their visits. They were asked:

(Question 2a):

"Did you receive what you expected from your visit here today?"

Ninety-six percent of the one-third sub-sample of respondents agreed that they had, in fact, received what they had expected.

2. Visitor Preference in Visiting Hours

Also noted in Section IV is the data collecting problem which occurred in Question 1 of supplementary questionnaire 1B. The multiple responses

accepted make analysis and interpretation questionable, if not impossible.

Table 27, below, presents preferences where the total number of responses has been used as the base, or equals 100%.

TABLE 27

DAYS OF WEEK AND TIMES OF DAY MENTIONED AS MOST CONVENIENT FOR MUSEUM VISITING
(expressed as % of mentions)

Day	Morning	Noon	Afternoon	Evening
Monday	5	2	5	.4
Tuesday	5	2	5	.4
Wednesday	5	2	5	.4
Thursday	5	2	5	.4
Friday	5	2	5	.4
All Week Days	25	10	25	2
Saturday	7	4	8	1
Sunday	5	3	6	1
All Days	37	17	39	4

From these data, one can conclude that evening visiting is not desired by the present audience, that Saturday appears most convenient for visitors when compared with any other single day, and that the noon hour does not have unusual attraction as has been suspected by some observers.

3. Museum Content Preferences

Question 3a of supplementary questionnaire 1B asked the one-third subsample which of the subjects dealt with in the museum was of most interest. The question was asked after their visits in the museum.

Table 28 presents the responses which were coded by the nine categories shown:

TABLE 28

MUSEUM CONTENT PREFERENCES OF VISITORS FOLLOWING A VISIT TO THE NEW YORK STATE MUSEUM

Subject of Most Interest	Total Sub-Sample N=559	Student Visitors N=128	Frequent Visitors N=17	First-Time Visitors N=260
Anthropology	37%	36%	29%	39%
Mammalogy	28	33	35	28
Geology	11	8	18	12
Everything in general	10	10	6	8
Palaeontology	8	8	6	7
Ornithology	6	5	6	5
Ichthyology, Entomology and Botony	1	--	1	1
	100%	100%	100%	100%

It is clear that visitors in general share common preferences, with no meaningful variations among sub-groups. While interpretations of these preferences must be left in large part, to museum staff, the following observations may be of interest.

a) The palaeontology gallery is the most modern and aesthetically satisfactory exhibit in the museum but is outranked by the old-fashioned geology hall.

b) The top preference for anthropology may reflect the fact that the Iroquois dioramas are a known and famous attraction at the museum; that the anthropology exhibits are highly interpretive, and that people are interested in people.

c) the preference of about two-thirds of respondents for either anthropology or mammalogy may be related to the fact that these subjects employ the diorama presentation more than do the others.

4. The New York State Museum Compared with Other Museums

Question 4a asked those visitors who had been to other science museums to rate the New York State Museum as better than, the same as, or worse than the others they had visited. The responses obtained indicated that:

> 55% of the sub-sample completing the supplementary questionnaire had visited other science museums; and that of this 55%, 29% thought the New York State Museum "better," 11% thought it "worse" and 59% thought it to be "the same."

In our opinion, this rating is not complimentary to the Museum. Of those who thought the Museum "better" (N=92), reasons most frequently given were:

exhibits well illustrated and described	60%
good layout	36%
exhibits well lighted and varied	18%

Of those who thought the museum "worse" (N=32), the reasons most frequently given were:

exhibits not varied enough	53%
poorly lighted	31%
too much emphasis on geology	22%

Question 3b asked, "What kinds of new or different exhibits would you like to see added to our museum?". Forty-one percent of the sub-sample completing the supplementary questionnaire made some suggestion. Among them, there were four of some note:

more early American exhibits	14%
more emphasis on New York State history	12%
*more "future prototype" exhibits	12%
more emphasis on archaeology	11%

*See letter, Doherty to Solmon, August 8, 1967.

5. Evaluations Following Museum Visit

The visitors who were asked to complete a second questionnaire at the end of their visits (1/3 of the total sample) were asked either to agree or to disagree with thirteen statements about the museum, by means of a six-point scale. The statements were derived from opinions or concerns of senior museum staff which were provided for this purpose. (See Appendix A.)

The opinions might be summed up as follows:

There are too few rest areas and places for people to sit. (Statement A)

The exhibits are too technical and thus are not well understood by visitors. (Statements B, E, H, J, K, M)

Some members of the staff felt that certain exhibits were too old-fashioned. (Statement I)

School classes visiting during the day were too noisy and were disturbing to other visitors. (Statement L)

Some members of the staff felt that use of tape-recorded "labels" and other audio devices would help the problem of comprehension. (Statement G)

Visitors would like restaurant or coffee shop facilities. (Statement C)

Museum publicity is inadequate. (Statement D)

The location of the museum is poor. (Statement F)

Experience indicates that this opportunity for criticism, especially when included in interviews being conducted in a museum or cultural institution,

encourages the respondents to be complimentary. As a result, we feel that the analysis is best done by examining that segment which is prepared to be negative, since it is probably indicative of the feelings of a larger group.

The total sample has been examined without comparisons with any subgroup such as students, first-time visitors, or Capitol District residents, since there are no significant differences between the total sample and subsamples for any of the ratings of the thirteen statements.

The questions of:

too few rest areas,

legibility of labels, and

high noise level,

can be dismissed, each of them having less than 15% of the respondents who felt they were in any way a problem. Also, few respondents, (less than 15%), were prepared to say that the museum was:

old-fashioned, or

not very interesting for the general public.

The results of the restaurant statement (C) are of note, with 34% of the visitors agreed that they would like a restaurant or coffee shop. As mentioned above, this response on the part of one-third of the respondents can be taken as a response indicative of the attitude of a larger portion of the visitors.

There was a critical response regarding the absence of publicity on the part of 21% of the sample. (See the observations in the section "Response to Promotion" that discusses dependence on word of mouth and indicates virtually no awareness of mass media advertising.)

The concern of the staff is also supported on the question of location of the museum, with 22% of the respondents expressing dissatisfaction.

The answer to the question of whether or not the exhibits in the present museum are too technical can only be inferred from the fact that:

90% of all visitors feel the museum is not for children.

80% feel scientists and university students would like it.

20% feel the explanations in the exhibits are too technical and complicated.

21% do not feel their questions are answered.

It might be argued that these data were not overly damaging because of the 80% who felt the labels were easy to read. However, the fact that 41% of the respondents expressed a desire for taped information about the exhibits might tend to negate that argument.

We feel that it can be concluded that:

a. more effective interpretation of exhibits is desired by visitors,

b. lack of publicity and the awkward location of the museum are both real problems for the museum,

c. restaurant facilities would be an asset.

REFERENCES

1. Abbey, D.S. and Cameron, Duncan F., The Museum Visitor: I - Survey Design. Toronto, Royal Ontario Museum, 1959.

Cameron, Duncan F. and Abbey, D.S., The Museum Visitor: II - Survey Results. Toronto, Royal Ontario Museum, 1960.

Abbey, D.S. and Cameron, Duncan F., The Museum Visitor: III - Supplementary Studies. Toronto, Royal Ontario Museum, 1961.

---

2. U.S. Bureau of the Census. U.S. Census of Population: 1960. General Population Characteristics, New York. Final Report PC(1)-34B, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1961.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. U.S. Census of Population: 1960. General Social and Economic Characteristics, New York. Final Report PC(1)-34C, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1962.

---

3. Borhegyi, Dr. Stephan F. de. Director, Milwaukee Public Museum. (Discussion at a session of the American Association of Museums' Annual Meetings, Chicago, 1966.) Dr. Borhegyi described informal studies conducted by graduate students under his direction.

---

4. Cameron, Duncan F. and Abbey, D.S., Museum Education and School Services at the New York State Museum in the South Mall Cultural Center. September, 1966. Ch. 4, "Individual and Group Use of the Museum," pp. 22-24.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRES USED IN THE 1966

NEW YORK STATE MUSEUM AUDIENCE STUDY

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
The State Education Department
Albany, New York 12224

DO NOT WRITE IN THESE SPACES

CARD NO. 1

(2-6)

(7-10)

(11-13)

(14-18)

(19)

(20-21)

(22)

(23)

(24)

(25)

(26)

(27)

(28)

(29)

(30)

(31)

(32)

(33)

(34-35)

MUSEUM VISITORS STUDY

INTERVIEW NO._____ TIME STARTED_____A.M. ( ) P.M. ( )

INTERVIEWER NO._____ DATE_____MON. ( ) TUE. ( )
1 2

WED. ( ) THUR. ( ) FRI. ( ) SAT. ( ) SUN. ( )
3 4 5 6 7

MUSEUM SURVEY 1A

Good morning/afternoon. My name is_____. We are doing a survey among visitors to the museum, and we'd like to ask you some questions.

REFUSALS: 1 2 3 4 5 _____

1-a) How many are there in your group?. . 0 1 2 3 4 5 6+

How many: Adult males . . . . . 0 1 2 3 4 5 6+
Adult females . . . . . 0 1 2 3 4 5 6+
Others under 21 years . . 0 1 2 3 4 5 6+

-b) (IF ANY UNDER 21 IN GROUP) At what school level are those under 21? (INCLUDE RESPONDENT IF UNDER 21)

How many at: Pre-school level . . . 0 1 2 3 4 5 6+
Elementary . . . . . 0 1 2 3 4 5 6+
Secondary . . . . . 0 1 2 3 4 5 6+
University . . . . . 0 1 2 3 4 5 6+
Postgraduate . . . . . 0 1 2 3 4 5 6+
Other (working etc.) . 0 1 2 3 4 5 6+

(NOTE: THE FIRST MEMBER OF A GROUP TO RESPOND TO THE INITIAL QUESTIONS SHALL ANSWER QUESTIONS 2 THROUGH THE END OF DIALOGUE, ACCORDING ONLY TO HIS PERSONAL FEELINGS AND REACTIONS.)

2-a) Is this your first visit to this museum?

YES ( )...Well, we are very glad that you came today. (GO TO
1 QUESTION 2-f)

NO ( )...(b) About how long ago was the last time you were here?

MORE THAN 5 YEARS AGO ( )1
FROM 1 TO 5 YEARS AGO ( )2
WITHIN PAST 12 MONTHS ( )3

(c) How many times have you visited this museum within the past twelve months, including this time?

ABOUT_____TIMES

-d) How many years ago was your first visit to this museum? ABOUT ____ YEARS AGO (36-37)

(IF NOT SURE, INVESTIGATE AGE AT THAT TIME AND ASK "WELL, ABOUT HOW MANY YEARS AGO WOULD THAT BE?" DO NOT RECORD REPLIES IN TERMS OF AGE BUT OF YEARS AGO)

2-e) With whom did you come on that first visit? (38)

With School Class	( )1
With Family	( )2
With Peer (s)	( )3
Other	( )4_____ (WRITE IN)

-f) Have you visited any other museums in the past twelve months? (39)
YES ( )1 NO ( )0

-g) (IF YES) Then altogether, how many different museums can you remember visiting in the past twelve months? (40-41)
_____DIFFERENT MUSEUMS

EVERYONE

-h) What kinds of museums do you visit most often?

Only This One	( )1	(42)
Historical	( )1	(43)
Natural History	( )1	(44)
Science and Technology	( )1	(45)
Industrial	( )1	
Art	( )1	(46)
Children's	( )1	(47)
Other	( )1_____ (DESCRIBE)	(48)

Now I'd like to ask a few questions about your visit here today.

3-a) What means of transportation did you use to get here? (49)

WALKED ( )1 GIVEN LIFT AND DROPPED OFF ( )4
BUS ( )2
BICYCLE ( )3 PRIVATE AUTOMOBILE ( )5 (50)

-b) Did you have difficulty finding a place to park? (51)
YES ( )1 NO ( )0

-c) How many blocks from here did you park? _____BLOCK(S) AWAY (52-53)

-d) Was this a state operated parking lot? YES ( )1 NO ( )0

4-a) We are not concerned with your name or address, but we would like to know where you live. (54)

State (If U.S.) _____ Other Country _____ (55-58)

If NEW YORK STATE ask:

County _____. (59-60)

-d) How many years ago was your first visit to this museum? ABOUT ____ YEARS AGO (36-37)

(IF NOT SURE, INVESTIGATE AGE AT THAT TIME AND ASK "WELL, ABOUT HOW MANY YEARS AGO WOULD THAT BE?" DO NOT RECORD REPLIES IN TERMS OF AGE BUT OF YEARS AGO)

2-e) With whom did you come on that first visit? (38)

With School Class ( )1
With Family ( )2
With Peer (s) ( )3
Other ( )4_____
(WRITE IN)

-f) Have you visited any other museums in the past twelve months? (39)
YES ( )1 NO ( )0

-g) (IF YES) Then altogether, how many different museums can you remember visiting in the past twelve months? (40-41)
_____DIFFERENT MUSEUMS

EVERYONE

-h) What kinds of museums do you visit most often?

Only This One ( )1 (42)
Historical ( )1 (43)
Natural History ( )1 (44)
Science and Technology ( )1 (45)
Industrial ( )1 (46)
Art ( )1 (47)
Children's ( )1 (48)
Other ( )1_____ (49)
(DESCRIBE) (50)

Now I'd like to ask a few questions about your visit here today.

3-a) What means of transportation did you use to get here? (51)

WALKED ( )1 GIVEN LIFT AND DROPPED OFF ( )4
BUS ( )2
BICYCLE ( )3 PRIVATE AUTOMOBILE ( )5

-b) Did you have difficulty finding a place to park?
YES ( )1 NO ( )0

-c) How many blocks from here did you park? _____BLOCK(S) AWAY (52-53)

-d) Was this a state operated parking lot? YES ( )1 NO ( )0

4-a) We are not concerned with your name or address, but we would like to know where you live. (54)

State (If U.S.) _____ Other Country _____ (55-58)

If NEW YORK STATE ask:

County _____. (59-60)

Area: Urban ( )1
Sub-Urban ( )2
Rural ( )3

(61)

Thank you very much. Now would you tell me why you've decided to visit the museum on this particular day? (PROBE--FIRST THING THAT COMES INTO HIS MIND).

Show friends/children ( )1
See exhibits ( )2
Curious ( )3
Part of planned program ( )4
Something to do ( )5
Other _____
(WRITE IN)

(62)

-b) Where were you today just before you came to the museum?

VACATIONING / SIGHTSEEING	( )1	IN STATE LIBRARY	( )4
AT HOME	( )2	IN EDUCATION DEPARTMENT	( )5
SHOPPING	( )3	AT A MEETING OR CONFERENCE	( )6
		AT WORK ELSEWHERE	( )7

OTHER (DESCRIBE)_____

(63)

If EITHER, how did you hear about the museum?

Radio -- Newspaper -- T.V. ( )1
Posters -- Brochures ( )2
Someone who had visited in the past ( )3
School related ( )4
Family related ( )5
Peer group related ( )6
Other _____
(WRITE IN)

(64)

4-c) What do you expect to get out of your visit to this museum?

General information/knowledge ( )1
Cultural enrichment ( )1
Educational exposure ( )1
Enjoyment ( )1
Other _____

(65)
(66)
(67)
(68)

4-d) Is your visit here today concerned with the following?
(READ LIST--CHECK ALL POSSIBILITIES YES OR NO)

	Yes	No
Visiting museum personnel	( )1	( )0
Visiting the Science Service	( )1	( )0
Present employment	( )1	( )0
Schoolwork or independent study	( )1	( )0
Group or club affiliation	( )1	( )0
General pleasure and interest	( )1	( )0

(69)
(70)
(71)
(72)
(73)
(74)
(75)

-e) About how long do you expect to spend in this museum today?

LESS THAN HALF AN HOUR ( )1
HALF TO ONE HOUR ( )2
ONE TO TWO HOURS ( )3
MORE THAN TWO HOURS ( )4
UNCERTAIN ( )5

(76)

INTERVIEWER REFER BACK TO Q. 4-a. IF NOT RESIDENT OF CAPITOL DISTRICT CHECK HERE ( ) AND SKIP TO QUESTION 7.

ASK ALL RESIDENTS OF CAPITOL DISTRICT----------CONSISTS OF

5-a) How long have you lived in this area?

6 MONTHS OR LESS ( )1
MORE THAN 6 MONTHS BUT LESS THAN 2 YEARS ( )2
MORE THAN 2 YEARS ( )3

Albany County
Rensselaer County
Saratoga County
Schenectady County
Schoharie County
Warren County
Washington County

(77)

(78)

-b) Are you a government employee? NO( )0...GO TO 5-c

YES( )...Is that federal, state, or local? FEDERAL( ) STATE( ) LOCAL( )
1 1 2 3

(79-80)

CARD NO. 2

-c) Do you work within five blocks of the museum? YES ( ) NO ( ) DOESN'T WORK( )
1 0 2

(2)

Sorry to keep you, but there are only a few more questions.

6-a) First, which local daily newspapers do you read frequently?

ALBANY TIMES UNION ( )1
KNICKERBOCKER NEWS ( )2
SCHENECTADY GAZETTE ( )3
SCHENECTADY UNION STAR ( )4
TROY RECORD (MORNING) ( )5
TROY RECORD (EVENING) ( )6
OTHER_____ ( )7
DOESN'T READ LOCAL PAPER ( )0

(3)

-b) Which two local radio stations do you listen to most frequently?

WROW ( )1
WPTR ( )2
WTRY ( )3
WABY ( )4
WOKO ( )5
WGY ( )6
WFLY ( )7
OTHER_____( )8
DOESN'T LISTEN ( )0

(4-5)

6-c) And which television channel do you watch most frequently?

CHANNEL 2 ( )1
CHANNEL 6 ( )2
CHANNEL 10 ( )3
CHANNEL 13 ( )4
CHANNEL 17 ( )5
DOESN'T WATCH T.V. ( )0

(6)

ASK EVERYONE

Now a few questions to give us some information about our museum visitors.

7-a) What was the highest school grade you completed? (7-8)

CIRCLE GRADE: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

-b) Did you have any post-high-school technical training (nursing school, mechanic's course, business course etc.)? YES( )1 NO( )0 (9)

-c) Did you attend college? YES( )1 NO( )0 (10)

-d) (IF YES) Did you get a degree? YES( )1 NO( )0 (11)

-e) (IF YES) What is your highest degree? (12)

ASSOCIATE DEGREE ( )1 MASTER'S DEGREE ( )3
BACHELOR'S DEGREE ( )2 DOCTORAL DEGREE ( )4

8-a) Are you the head of the household - that is, the person mainly responsible for its support? YES( )1 NO( )0 (13)

8-b) (IF NOT HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD) What is the occupation of the head of the household? (14-15)

_____
(WRITE IN)

8-c) (IF NOT HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD) What is <u>your</u> occupation? (16-17)

_____
(WRITE IN)

9. To which of these age groups do you belong? (SHOW AGE CARD) (18)

CIRCLE: 1 2 3 4 5 6

10. And in which of these groups would you put your total family income (SHOW INCOME CARD) (19)

CIRCLE: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

<u>INTERVIEWER RECORD WITHOUT ASKING</u>: RESPONDENT WAS: MALE( )1 FEMALE( )2 (20)

VERY COOPERATIVE( )4 COOPERATIVE( )3 NOT COOPERATIVE( )2 HOSTILE( )1 (21)

TIME INTERVIEW ENDED: _____A.M.( ) P.M.( ) (22-25)

COMPLETED AND CHECKED BY _____
(INTERVIEWER'S SIGNATURE)

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
The State Education Department
Albany, New York 12224

MUSEUM SURVEY 1B

CARD NO. 2

DO NOT WRITE IN THESE SPACES

Thank you so much for coming back.

1. If we were planning to change the Museum's open hours, which day of the week and what time of day would be most convenient for you personally to visit the Museum?

	Morning	Noon	Afternoon	Evening
Monday				
Tuesday				
Wednesday				
Thursday				
Friday				
Saturday				
Sunday				

(26-29)
(30-33)
(34-37)
(38-41)
(42-45)
(46-49)
(50-53)

BEFORE ASKING QUESTION 2 REFER BACK TO THE RESPONDENT'S ANSWER TO 4c. (...What did you expect to gain?)

2. When we talked earlier, you told me what you hoped to get out of your visit today.

(READ RESPONSE TO 4c.)

2-a) Did you receive what you expected from your visit here today?

Yes ( )1
No ( )0

(54)

If NO, probe for reason why.

_____

_____

_____

(WRITE IN)

(55-56)

3-a) Which one of the subjects dealt with in this Museum is of most interest to you?
(DO NOT READ LIST--MERELY CHECK APPLICABLE TERM)

Anthropology - Indians	( )1	Ichthyology - Fishes	( )6
Botany - Plants	( )2	Mammalogy - Animals	( )7
Entomology - Insects, Spiders	( )3	Ornithology - Birds	( )8
Geology - Rocks, Minerals	( )4	Paleontology - Fossils, Fossil Forest	( )9
		Everything in General	( )10

(57-58)

-b) What kinds of new or different exhibits would you like to see added to our museum?

(59-60)

_____

(WRITE IN)

4-a) This is a science museum. Have you visited other science museums in the past?

Yes ( )1
No ( )0

(61)

IF YES - How does this museum compare?

Is better than ( )1
Is same as ( )2
Is worse than ( )3

(62)

4-b) Why?

Good lay out	( )1 (63)
Exhibits well illustrated and described	( )1 (64)
Exhibits well lighted and varied	( )1 (65)
Interesting movies	( )1 (66)
Centrally located; easy to find	( )1 (67)
Poorly lighted	( )1 (68)
Explanatory labels difficult to read	( )1 (69)
Exhibits not varied enough	( )1 (70)
Too much emphasis on geology	( )1 (71)

Completed and Checked _____
Signature

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
The State Education Department
Albany, New York 12224

MUSEUM VISITORS STUDY - MUSEUM SURVEY 1C

CARD NO. 2

DO NOT WRITE IN THESE SPACES

We'd like to know how much you agree or disagree with certain statements that people might possibly make about the Museum after a visit. What we want is your personal opinion, telling us the extent of your feeling.

As an example, a statement could be made about art galleries saying that they show too much modern art. You might agree strongly with this statement, or only moderately, or you might have a hard time making up your mind but tend to agree if you had to choose. Or it could be just the opposite - you might disagree strongly, or moderately, or might tend to disagree if you had to choose. Like this:

	AGREE STRONGLY	AGREE MODERATELY	HARD TO SAY BUT IF I MUST CHOOSE: TEND TO AGREE	HARD TO SAY BUT IF I MUST CHOOSE: TEND TO DISAGREE	DISAGREE MODERATELY	DISAGREE STRONGLY
Art galleries show too much modern art	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

If you feel that art galleries don't show nearly enough modern art, you would put your check under "DISAGREE STRONGLY." If you feel that they show somewhat too much modern art but don't feel strongly about it, you would check under "AGREE MODERATELY." And so on. Now - would you check how you feel about the amount of modern art they show? (IF YOU DO NOT UNDERSTAND WHAT TO DO, PLEASE ASK INTERVIEWER FOR MORE EXPLANATION)

Now for some statements about this museum. Please check one answer for each question below.

	AGREE STRONGLY	AGREE MODERATELY	HARD TO SAY BUT IF I MUST CHOOSE: TEND TO AGREE	HARD TO SAY BUT IF I MUST CHOOSE: TEND TO DISAGREE	DISAGREE MODERATELY	DISAGREE STRONGLY	
a) There are plenty of restful areas and places for people to sit down in this museum	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	(73)
b) The explanations in the exhibits are too technical and complicated for most people	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	(74)
c) If the museum had a restaurant or coffee shop I would have used it today	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	(75)
d) The museum is well advertised and I often hear news about it	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	(76)

(72)

	AGREE STRONGLY	AGREE MODER-ATELY	HARD TO SAY BUT IF I MUST CHOOSE: TEND TO AGREE	HARD TO SAY BUT IF I MUST CHOOSE: TEND TO DISAGREE	DISAGREE MODER-ATELY	DISAGREE STRONGLY	
e) Scientists and university students would like this museum.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	(77)
f) The location of the museum is poor and inconvenient	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	(78)
g) Instead of the printed labels, I would prefer information about exhibits that was recorded and played when I pushed a button	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	(79)
h) The exhibits are designed mostly for children	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	(80)
							CARD NO. 3
i) This museum is stuffy and old-fashioned	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	(2)
j) The museum exhibits answer my questions and give plenty of information	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	(3)
k) Most of the exhibits are not very interesting for the general public	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	(4)
l) Some museum visitors make too much noise for others to enjoy the exhibits	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	(5)
m) The printing on the exhibit labels is easy to read	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	(6)

Thank you very much for helping us with our study. This is <u>your</u> museum and we are interested in <u>your</u> opinions. Please return this form to your interviewer who will group it with the rest of your answers.

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRES USED IN THE 1958

ROYAL ONTARIO MUSEUM AUDIENCE STUDY

R.O.M.

VISITOR SURVEY

Survey #	
Questionnaire	
Period 1 2 3 4	

INTERVIEWER'S NOTE: Approach group and address them generally; then interview the person who appears to act as spokesman.

"Good morning / afternoon I am Mrs. / Miss . . . . . of the Museum staff; and we're doing a survey of our visitors...."

1 How many are there in your group? 1 2 3 4 5 +5

Male (adult)	1 2 3 4 5 +5
Female (")	1 2 3 4 5 +5
Others below 21 years	1 2 3 4 5 +5

2 At what school-level are the others in your group?

Pre-school	1 2 3 4 5 +5
Elementary	1 2 3 4 5 +5
Secondary	1 2 3 4 5 +5
University	1 2 3 4 5 +5
Other working, etc.	1 2 3 4 5 +5

3 (a) Have you ever visited this museum before? 1 Yes ( ) 2 No ( ) X Not sure ( )

If "Yes"

3(b) When was the last time? Month_____ Yr._____

3(c) How many times have you visited the museum in the last 12 months?_____

4 (a) How did you get here to-day? 1 Walked ( ) 2 Street-car (bus) ( ) 3 Bicycle ( ) 4 Automobile ( ) 5 Driven: i.e. given lift / taxi / hitch-hiking ( )

If "Auto"

4(b) Did you have any difficulty finding parking? 1 Yes ( ) 2 No ( )

4(c) How far away (how many blocks) did you park?

Number of blocks _____
Used Museum lot ( ) 0

5 (a) What is your home address?

Number and street _____

City _____

Prov., State
Country _____

If from Toronto area

5(b) Why did you come to the museum today?

_____

_____

If reply "To see X (special) exhibit"

5(c) How did you find out about this showing?

0	T.V.	( )	6	Word of mouth	( )
1	Radio	( )	7	"Orbit"	( )
2	Press	( )	8	School visit follow-up	( )
3	Notice Board	( )	Y	No answer or	
4	Direct Mail	( )		No specific answer	( )
9	Other_____				

If from outside Toronto area

5(d) What is the reason for your trip to Toronto?

1 Business ( ) 2 Holiday ( )
3 Visiting CNE ( )
Other_____

(e) In which part of the Museum are you most interested? _____

_____

6 (a) If now living in the Toronto area: Ask
How long have you lived in the Toronto area? _____

(b) Where were you born? 1 Canada ( )
Other_____

If "Other"

6(c) How many years have you lived in Canada?

0 ( ) up to 1 yr. 2 ( ) 6 - 10 yrs.
1 ( ) 2 - 5 yrs. 3 ( ) +10 yrs.

7 (a) Do you live in a suite, apartment, private room 1 ( ) OR do you live in a house 2 ( ) ?

If "house"

7(b) Do you own or rent the house?

1 own ( ) 2 rent ( )
other_____

8 (a) What is your occupation?

Housewife	( ) 1	Self employed ( ) 3	
Student	( ) 2	doing what? _____	
Retired	( ) 5	_____	
Unemployed	( ) 6		
Widow(er)	( ) 7		
Armed forces	( ) 8	Works for company ( ) 4	
Teacher	( ) 9	doing what? _____	
Other	( ) 0	_____	
No Answer	( ) Y		
		where? _____	

If "unemployed" 8(b) Where was your last job _____ ? what _____

9 (a) Did you attend college or university? 1 Yes ( ) 2 No ( )

If "No" 9(b) Did you attend high school or technical school? 1 Yes ( ) 2 No ( )

10 (a) Which radio stations do you listen to most often?

CJBC ( )		2 CKEY ( )
CBL ( )	1 CBC	3 CHUM ( )
		4 CFRB ( )
		5 CKFH ( )

(b) Do you watch T.V.? 1 Yes ( ) 2 No ( )

If "Yes" 10(c) Which channel do you watch most frequently

2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	17
1		1		6					9			1

circle answers

(d) Which newspaper dc you read most often? _____

11 (a) Are you a museum member? 1 Yes ( ) 2 No ( )

(b) Are you a member of a museum group? 1 Yes ( ) 2 No ( )

If "Yes" 11(c) Which one(s)

Walker Club	( )1
Brodie Club	( )1
Saturday Morning Club	( )1
Junior Field Naturalists	( )1
Women's Committees	( )1
Other _____	( )2

12	SHOW CARD ASK Would you please tell me to which of these age groups you belong 1 2 3 4 5 ? (circle one)	
	..... and which of these income brackets please? 1 2 3 4 5 ? (circle one) "Thank you very much"	

BE SURE TO RECORD THE FOLLOWING:

	SEX of respondent MALE ( )1 FEMALE ( )2
	DAY Sunday ( )1 Tuesday ( )2 Wednesday ( )3 Thursday ( )4 Friday ( )5 Saturday ( )6
	TIME 10:00 ( )1 12:30 ( )2 2:00 ( )3 3:00 ( )4
	Number of persons refusing to answer questionnaire between this and the last completed form 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Interviewer: _____ sign please

Coding _____ Checking _____

To which of these age groups do you belong?

Group 1: 14 years or under

Group 2: 15 to 24 years

Group 3: 25 to 34 years

Group 4: 35 to 49 years

Group 5: 50 years or over

In which of these income brackets are you?

Group 1: Up to $2,999 per year

Group 2: $3,000 to $3,999 per year

Group 3: $4,000 to $4,999 per year

Group 4: $5,000 to $6,999 per year

Group 5: $7,000 and above.

Cards shown to interviewees for response to question 12.

ERIC Clearinghouse

JAN 4 1971

on Adult Education